

THE ADDITIVITY OF POROSITY IDEALS

Jörg Brendle*

Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, 52900 Ramat-Gan, Israel

and

Mathematisches Institut der Universität Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 10, 72076 Tübingen, Germany

Abstract. We show that several σ -ideals related to porous sets have additivity ω_1 and cofinality 2^ω . This answers a question addressed by Miroslav Repický.

1. Introduction. Given a σ -ideal $\mathcal{I}$ on the reals $\mathbb{I} := [0, 1]$ we let

$add(\mathcal{I}) :=$ the least κ so that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [\mathbb{I}]^\kappa$ ($\cup \mathcal{F} \notin \mathcal{I}$);

$cov(\mathcal{I}) :=$ the least κ so that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [\mathbb{I}]^\kappa$ ($\cup \mathcal{F} = \mathbb{I}$);

$unif(\mathcal{I}) :=$ the least κ so that $[\mathbb{I}]^\kappa \setminus \mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$;

$cof(\mathcal{I}) :=$ the least κ so that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [\mathbb{I}]^\kappa \forall A \in \mathcal{I} \exists B \in \mathcal{F} (A \subseteq B)$.

Next, let $A \subseteq \mathbb{I}$ be a set of reals. The *porosity* and the *symmetric porosity* of the set A at a real $r \in \mathbb{I}$ are defined by

$$p(A, r) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sup \frac{\lambda(A, (r - \epsilon, r + \epsilon))}{\epsilon}, \text{ and}$$

$$s(A, r) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sup \frac{\lambda^*(A, (r - \epsilon, r + \epsilon))}{\epsilon},$$

1991 *Mathematics subject classification.* 03E05

Key words and phrases. porous sets, cardinal invariants

* The author wishes to thank the MINERVA-foundation for supporting him

respectively, where $\lambda(A, I)$ denotes the maximal length of an open subinterval of the interval I which is disjoint from A ; similarly $\lambda^*(A, (c, d))$ stands for the maximal $\delta \geq 0$ so that $(c, c + \delta) \cup (d - \delta, d)$ is disjoint from A . For $a \in A$ we have $s(A, a) \leq p(A, a) \leq 1$. A is *porous* (*strongly porous*, respectively) iff $p(A, a) > 0$ ($p(A, a) = 1$, resp.) for every $a \in A$; similarly, A is *symmetrically porous* (*strongly symmetrically porous*, respectively) iff $s(A, a) > 0$ ($s(A, a) = 1$, resp.) for every $a \in A$. Finally, we let

$\mathcal{P} :=$ the σ -ideal generated by the strongly porous sets;

$\mathcal{P}^+ :=$ the σ -ideal generated by the porous sets;

$\mathcal{S} :=$ the σ -ideal generated by the strongly symmetrically porous sets;

$\mathcal{S}^+ :=$ the σ -ideal generated by the symmetrically porous sets.

The elements of $\mathcal{P}$ ($\mathcal{P}^+$, $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{S}^+$, respectively) are called σ -*strongly porous sets* (σ -*porous sets*, etc., respectively).

The goal of this note is to show (in section 2) $\text{add}(\mathcal{P}) = \text{add}(\mathcal{P}^+) = \text{add}(\mathcal{S}) = \text{add}(\mathcal{S}^+) = \omega_1$ and $\text{cof}(\mathcal{P}) = \text{cof}(\mathcal{P}^+) = \text{cof}(\mathcal{S}) = \text{cof}(\mathcal{S}^+) = 2^\omega$. In section 3 we make some remarks, and state a question, concerning the invariants $\text{unif}(\mathcal{I})$ and $\text{cov}(\mathcal{I})$ where $\mathcal{I}$ is again one of the four ideals defined above. For a survey concerning known results about these cardinals, as well as further references, we refer the reader to the survey article [Re].

2. Proof of the main result. We shall work in a space of the form $X := \prod_n g(n)$, where $g \in (\omega \setminus 2)^\omega$; i.e. $f \in X$ iff $f \in \omega^\omega$ and for all $n \in \omega$, $f(n) < g(n)$. Using the Cantor expansion, we can almost identify X and the unit interval $\mathbb{I}$ in a canonical way: reals $r \in \mathbb{I}$ correspond to reals $f \in X$ via the map $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{I}$ defined by

$$r = \phi(f) = \sum_{n \in \omega} \frac{f(n)}{g(0) \cdot \dots \cdot g(n)} .$$

However, we shall be more interested in a slightly different identification. Let $g \in \omega^\omega$ be strictly increasing and taking odd values such that there are strictly increasing sequences of natural numbers $\langle m_n; n \in \omega \rangle$ and $\langle \ell_n; n \in \omega \rangle$ so that

- (i) $\frac{\ell_n^{m_n}}{g(n)} \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii) $\frac{\ell_{n-1}}{\ell_n} \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Next, given $n \in \omega$, we let μ_n be the unique measure on $P(g(n))$ satisfying

- (a) $\mu_n(g(n)) = 1$;
- (b) $\mu_n(\{i\}) = \mu_n(\{j\})$ for $m_n \leq i \leq j \leq g(n) - m_n - 1$;
- (c) $\mu_n(\{i\}) = \mu_n(\{g(n) - i - 1\}) = \frac{\mu_n(\{i+1\})}{\ell_n}$ for $i < m_n$.

We equip X with the product measure of the μ_n . This gives another almost-identification of X and $\mathbb{I}$: the idea is that for $\sigma \in \prod_{n < \ell} g(n)$, the open set $[\sigma] := \{f \in X; \sigma \subseteq f\}$ corresponds to an interval in $\mathbb{I}$ of length $\prod_{n < \ell} \mu_n(\{\sigma(n)\})$. We call this almost-correspondence $\tilde{\phi} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{I}$, and say $A \subseteq X$ is porous (or strongly porous, etc.) iff $\tilde{\phi}(A)$ is. Since $\tilde{\phi} \circ \tilde{\phi}^{-1}(B) = B$ and $\tilde{\phi}^{-1} \circ \tilde{\phi}(A) = A \cup C$ for some at most countable $C \subseteq X$, the σ -ideals of σ -porous (σ -strongly porous, etc.) sets can be identified.

Choose $\langle k_n; n \in \omega \rangle$ a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers so that $k_{n+1} - k_n \geq 10$. Let $\langle A_\alpha; \alpha < 2^\omega \rangle$ be a sequence of almost-disjoint subsets of ω . For $\alpha < 2^\omega$ we define $B_\alpha := \{f \in X; \forall n \in A_\alpha (f(k_n) = \frac{g(k_n)-1}{2})\}$. Each B_α is easily seen to be strongly symmetrically porous. We claim:

THEOREM. *Whenever $C \subseteq X$ is σ -porous then for all but countably many $\alpha \in 2^\omega$, $B_\alpha \not\subseteq C$.*

COROLLARY. *For $\mathcal{I} \in \{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}^+, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^+\}$, $\text{add}(\mathcal{I}) = \omega_1$ and $\text{cof}(\mathcal{I}) = 2^\omega$.*

Proof of Corollary from Theorem. As $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^+, \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^+$, $\{B_\alpha; \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ witnesses $\text{add}(\mathcal{I}) = \omega_1$ for any of the σ -ideals. Furthermore any family $\mathcal{F}$ of sets from $\mathcal{I}$ of size $< 2^\omega$ cannot be cofinal, because some B_α will not be contained in any member of $\mathcal{F}$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem. Let $C = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} C_i$, where each C_i is porous. Fix $\sigma \in \prod_{n < \ell} g(n)$ (for some $\ell \in \omega$), $m < \lfloor \frac{\ell}{2} \rfloor$ and $\Gamma \subseteq 2^\omega$ finite. We set

$$B(\sigma, m, \Gamma) := \{f \in X; \sigma \subseteq f \wedge \forall n \geq \ell (m \leq f(n) \leq g(n) - m - 1) \wedge \\ \wedge \forall \alpha \in \Gamma \forall n \in A_\alpha (k_n \geq \ell \rightarrow f(k_n) = \frac{g(k_n)-1}{2})\} \text{ and}$$

$$\hat{B}(\sigma, m, \Gamma) := \{\tau \supseteq \sigma; \forall n (\ell \leq n < lh(\tau) \rightarrow m \leq \tau(n) \leq g(n) - m - 1) \wedge \\ \wedge \forall \alpha \in \Gamma \forall n \in A_\alpha (\ell \leq k_n < lh(\tau) \rightarrow \tau(k_n) = \frac{g(k_n)-1}{2})\}.$$

Given $i \in \omega$, we say Γ is (σ, m, i) -funny iff

either (I) there are uncountably many Δ_α ($\alpha < \omega_1$) which are pairwise disjoint so that for all $\alpha < \omega_1$

$$B(\sigma, m+1, \Gamma \cup \Delta_\alpha) \cap C_i = \emptyset;$$

or (II) for some $\tau \supseteq \sigma$ ($[\tau] \cap C_i = \emptyset \wedge \tau \in \hat{B}(\sigma, m, \Gamma)$).

MAIN OBSERVATION. *Given σ, m, i as above, there is $\Omega \subseteq 2^\omega$ countable so that whenever $\Delta \subseteq 2^\omega \setminus \Omega$ is finite, then Δ is (σ, m, i) -funny.*

Proof of Main Observation. Suppose not. Then we can easily construct a sequence $\langle \Delta_\alpha; \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ of pairwise disjoint finite sets none of which is (σ, m, i) -funny. By clause (I) of the definition of funniness applied to Δ_0 there is $\alpha < \omega_1$ so that $B(\sigma, m+1, \Delta_0 \cup \Delta_\alpha) \cap C_i \neq \emptyset$. Choose f from the latter set. Let $p := p(\tilde{\phi}(C), \tilde{\phi}(f)) > 0$. Find ϵ so small that ϵ and $n = n_\epsilon$, which is unique with $\mu([f \upharpoonright n]) \geq \epsilon$ and $\mu([f \upharpoonright n+1]) < \epsilon$, satisfy:

- (A) $\lambda := \lambda(\tilde{\phi}(C_i), (\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon, \tilde{\phi}(f) + \epsilon)) > \frac{p}{2} \cdot \epsilon$;
- (B) $\frac{\ell_n^{m_n}}{g(n)}$ is small compared to p ;
- (C) $\frac{\ell_{n-1}}{\ell_n}$ is small compared to p ;
- (D) $(\bigcup_{\beta \in \Delta_0} A_\beta) \cap (\bigcup_{\beta \in \Delta_\alpha} A_\beta) \subseteq n'$ and $n \geq k_{n'}$.

Without loss $I := (\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon, \tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon + \lambda)$ is disjoint from $\tilde{\phi}(C_i)$. Clearly $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \notin \tilde{\phi}[f \upharpoonright n+1]$. Also we either have $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[f \upharpoonright n \hat{\ } \langle j \rangle]$ for some $j < f(n)$ or $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[f \upharpoonright (n-1) \hat{\ } \langle j \rangle]$ for some $j < f(n-1)$ or $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[f \upharpoonright (n-2) \hat{\ } \langle f(n-2) - 1 \rangle]$ [this is because $\frac{\mu([f \upharpoonright n-1])}{g(n-1) - 2 \cdot m_{n-1}} > \mu([f \upharpoonright n]) \geq \epsilon$, which implies $\mu([f \upharpoonright (n-2) \hat{\ } \langle f(n-2) - 1 \rangle]) > \epsilon \cdot \frac{g(n-1) - 2 \cdot m_{n-1}}{\ell_{n-2}} > \epsilon$]. The core of the proof is to construct $\tau \supseteq f \upharpoonright n-2$ so that $lh(\tau) \leq n+2$, $\forall j$ ($n-2 \leq j \leq n+1 \rightarrow m \leq \tau(j) \leq g(j) - m - 1$) and $[\tau] \cap C_i = \emptyset$ ($\clubsuit$).

It is easy to see that one of the following three cases must hold:

Case 1. For $\sigma_j = f \upharpoonright j - 1$, where $j \in \{n, n+1\}$, we have $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[\sigma_j \hat{\ } \langle k \rangle]$, where $m \leq k < f(j-1)$ ($k < f(j-1) - 1$ in case $j = n$).

Note that for any such k we have $\mu([\sigma_j \hat{\ } \langle k \rangle]) \leq \mu([\sigma_j \hat{\ } \langle k+1 \rangle]) < \epsilon \cdot \ell_{j-1}^{m_{j-1}}$ [in case $j = n$, this follows because the assumption $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[\sigma_n \hat{\ } \langle k \rangle]$ implies $\mu([\sigma_n \hat{\ } \langle f(n-1) - 1 \rangle]) < \epsilon$; in case $j = n+1$, this is immediate from $\mu([f \upharpoonright n+1]) < \epsilon$]. Let ℓ be so that $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[\sigma_j \hat{\ } \langle k \rangle \hat{\ } \langle \ell \rangle]$. In case $\ell < g(j) - m - 1$ find $0 < \ell' \leq m$ so that $m \leq \ell + \ell' \leq g(j) - m - 1$, and we have

$$\sum_{\tilde{\ell} \leq \ell'} \mu([\sigma_j \hat{\ } \langle k \rangle \hat{\ } \langle \ell + \tilde{\ell} \rangle]) < \epsilon \cdot \frac{(m+1) \cdot \ell_{j-1}^{m_{j-1}}}{g(j) - 2 \cdot m_j} < \epsilon \cdot \frac{p}{2} < \lambda.$$

This entails $\tilde{\phi}[\sigma_j \hat{\langle k \rangle} \hat{\langle \ell + \ell' \rangle}] \subseteq I$, and so $[\sigma_j \hat{\langle k \rangle} \hat{\langle \ell + \ell' \rangle}] \cap C_i = \emptyset$. Hence $\tau = \sigma_j \hat{\langle k \rangle} \hat{\langle \ell + \ell' \rangle}$ will work. In case $\ell \geq g(j) - m - 1$ we compute

$$\sum_{g(j) > \tilde{\ell} \geq \ell} \mu([\sigma_j \hat{\langle k \rangle} \hat{\langle \tilde{\ell} \rangle}]) + \sum_{\tilde{\ell} \leq m} \mu([\sigma_j \hat{\langle k+1 \rangle} \hat{\langle \tilde{\ell} \rangle}]) < \epsilon \cdot \frac{2 \cdot (m+1) \cdot \ell_{j-1}^{m_{j-1}-1}}{g(j) - 2 \cdot m_j} < \epsilon \cdot \frac{p}{2} < \lambda.$$

Thus $\tau = \sigma_j \hat{\langle k+1 \rangle} \hat{\langle m \rangle}$ is as required.

Case 2. For $\sigma_j = f \upharpoonright j - 2$, where $j \in \{n, n+1\}$, we have:

either $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[\sigma_j \hat{\langle f(j-2) - 1 \rangle} \hat{\langle g(j-1) - m - 1 \rangle} \hat{\langle g(j) - k - 1 \rangle}]$, where $k \leq m$,

or $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[\sigma_j \hat{\langle f(j-2) - 1 \rangle} \hat{\langle g(j-1) - k - 1 \rangle}]$, where $k < m$,

or $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[f \upharpoonright (j-1) \hat{\langle k \rangle}]$, where $k < m$.

In this case we necessarily have $\mu([f \upharpoonright (j-1) \hat{\langle m \rangle}]) < \epsilon$, and hence $\mu([\sigma_j \hat{\langle f(j-2) - 1 \rangle} \hat{\langle g(j-1) - m - 1 \rangle}]) < \epsilon \cdot \ell_{j-2}$. Thus (putting $\tilde{\sigma}_j = \sigma_j \hat{\langle f(j-2) - 1 \rangle}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_j = f \upharpoonright j - 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \leq m} \mu([\tilde{\sigma}_j \hat{\langle g(j-1) - m - 1 \rangle} \hat{\langle g(j) - k - 1 \rangle}]) + \sum_{k < m} \mu([\tilde{\sigma}_j \hat{\langle g(j-1) - k - 1 \rangle}]) + \\ & + \sum_{k < m} \mu([\hat{\sigma}_j \hat{\langle k \rangle}]) + \sum_{k \leq m} \mu([\hat{\sigma}_j \hat{\langle m \rangle} \hat{\langle k \rangle}]) < \epsilon \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\frac{(m+1) \cdot \ell_{j-2}}{g(j) - 2 \cdot m_j} + \sum_{k < m} \frac{\ell_{j-2}}{\ell_{j-1}^{k+1}} \right) < \epsilon \cdot \frac{p}{2} < \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\tau = f \upharpoonright (j-1) \hat{\langle m \rangle} \hat{\langle m \rangle}$ is as required.

Case 3. For $\sigma_j = f \upharpoonright (j-2) \hat{\langle f(j-2) - 1 \rangle}$, where $j \in \{n, n+1\}$, we have:

either $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[\sigma_j \hat{\langle k \rangle}]$, where $k < g(j-1) - m - 1$,

or $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[\sigma_j \hat{\langle g(j-1) - m - 1 \rangle} \hat{\langle k \rangle}]$, where $k < g(j) - m - 1$.

As before we necessarily have $\mu([f \upharpoonright (j-1) \hat{\langle m \rangle}]) < \epsilon$, and hence $\mu([\sigma_j \hat{\langle k \rangle}]) < \epsilon \cdot \ell_{j-2} \cdot \ell_{j-1}^{m_{j-1}-1}$ (for $k \leq g(j-1) - m - 1$). If $k \geq m$ we can finish similarly to case 1 [i.e. we let ℓ be so that $\tilde{\phi}(f) - \epsilon \in \tilde{\phi}[\sigma_j \hat{\langle k \rangle} \hat{\langle \ell \rangle}]$ and split into the two subcases $\ell < g(j) - m - 1$ and $\ell \geq g(j) - m - 1$]. Note that

$$\sum_{\ell < m} \mu([\sigma_j \hat{\langle \ell \rangle}]) + \sum_{\tilde{\ell} \leq m} \mu([\sigma_j \hat{\langle m \rangle} \hat{\langle \tilde{\ell} \rangle}]) < \epsilon \cdot \left(\sum_{\ell < m} \frac{\ell_{j-2}}{\ell_{j-1}^{\ell+1}} + \frac{(m+1) \cdot \ell_{j-2}}{g(j) - 2 \cdot m_j} \right) < \epsilon \cdot \frac{p}{2} < \lambda.$$

Thus if $k < m$, $\tau = \sigma_j \hat{\langle m \rangle} \hat{\langle m \rangle}$ will work (in fact this is similar to case 2).

Thus we have found τ as required in ($\clubsuit$). By almost-disjointness and the choice of n we necessarily have either $\tau \in \hat{B}(\sigma, m, \Delta_0)$ or $\tau \in \hat{B}(\sigma, m, \Delta_\alpha)$. Thus either Δ_0 or Δ_α is funny, and we reach a contradiction. This proves the Main Observation. $\square$

Conclusion. By the Main Observation, there is $\Omega \subseteq 2^\omega$ countable so that whenever $\Gamma \subseteq 2^\omega \setminus \Omega$ is finite, then Γ is (σ, m, i) -funny for all $\sigma \in \prod_{n < \ell} g(n)$ (some $\ell \in \omega$), $m < [\frac{\ell}{2}]$ and $i \in \omega$.

Fix $\alpha \in 2^\omega \setminus \Omega$. We construct recursively $\sigma_i \in \prod_{n < \ell(i)} g(n)$, where $\ell(i) \in \omega$, $m(i) < [\frac{\ell(i)}{2}]$ and $\Gamma_i \subseteq 2^\omega \setminus \Omega$ finite so that

- (1) $\{\alpha\} = \Gamma_0, \Gamma_i \subseteq \Gamma_{i+1}$;
- (2) $\ell(0) = 2$ and $\ell(i) < \ell(i+1)$;
- (3) $m(0) = 0$ and $m(i) \leq m(i+1)$;
- (4) $\sigma_{i+1} \in \hat{B}(\sigma_i, m(i), \Gamma_i)$;
- (5) $B(\sigma_{i+1}, m(i+1), \Gamma_{i+1}) \cap C_i = \emptyset$.

— $i = 0$. Trivial.

— $i \rightarrow i+1$. Γ_i is $(\sigma_i, m(i), i)$ -funny. So either find $\Gamma_i \subseteq \Gamma_{i+1} \subseteq 2^\omega \setminus \Omega$ so that $B(\sigma_i, m(i)+1, \Gamma_{i+1}) \cap C_i = \emptyset$; in this case $\ell(i+1) = \ell(i) + 2$, $\sigma_{i+1} \in \hat{B}(\sigma_i, m(i)+1, \Gamma_{i+1})$ of length $\ell(i+1)$, $m(i+1) = m(i) + 1$, and (1) — (5) are satisfied. Or find $\tau \supseteq \sigma_i$ so that $[\tau] \cap C_i = \emptyset$ and $\tau \in \hat{B}(\sigma_i, m(i), \Gamma_i)$. In case $\tau \supset \sigma_i$ let $\sigma_{i+1} = \tau$ and $\ell(i+1) = lh(\tau)$; otherwise $\ell(i) = \ell(i) + 1$ and $\sigma_{i+1} \in \hat{B}(\sigma_i, m(i), \Gamma_i)$. We let $\Gamma_{i+1} = \Gamma_i$ and $m(i+1) = m(i)$. Again (1) — (5) are satisfied.

This concludes the construction. Let $f = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \sigma_i$. It is easily seen that $f \in B_\alpha \setminus C$, thus proving the Theorem. $\square$

3. Porosity and evasion. We were motivated to prove the above result by our discussion of evasion ideals [Br, section 3] which seem to be closely related to porosity ideals.

As in section 2, fix $g \in (\omega \setminus 2)^\omega$, and let $X := \prod_n g(n)$. Following Blass [Bl, section 4] (see also [Br, 3.1.]), an X -predictor is a pair $\pi = (D_\pi, (\pi_n; n \in D_\pi))$ such that for every $n \in D_\pi$, $\pi_n : \prod_{k < n} g(k) \rightarrow g(n)$; π predicts $f \in X$ iff $\forall^\infty n \in D_\pi$ ($\pi_n(f \upharpoonright n) = f(n)$); otherwise f evades π . $\mathbf{e}_X := \min\{|\mathcal{F}|; \mathcal{F} \subseteq X \wedge \forall X\text{-predictors } \pi \exists f \in X (f \text{ evades } \pi)\}$ is the evasion number. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{I}_X := \{A \subseteq X; \text{ there is a countable set of } X\text{-predictors } \Pi \text{ so that for all } f \in A \text{ there is } \pi \in \Pi \text{ predicting } f\}$ [Br, 3.5.]. Making again a standard

identification between X and $\mathbb{I}$ as at the beginning of section 2, we see that $\mathcal{I}_{2^\omega} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^+$ and $\mathcal{I}_X \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ for $X = \prod_n g(n)$, where g converges to infinity [moreover, the sets B_α which are crucial for the proof in section 2 are elements of $\mathcal{I}_X$]. Thus $\mathfrak{e}_X \leq \text{unif}(\mathcal{I}_X) \leq \text{unif}(\mathcal{P})$ and $\mathfrak{e}_{2^\omega} \leq \text{unif}(\mathcal{I}_{2^\omega}) \leq \text{unif}(\mathcal{P}^+)$ as well as $\text{cov}(\mathcal{P}) \leq \text{cov}(\mathcal{I}_X)$ and $\text{cov}(\mathcal{P}^+) \leq \text{cov}(\mathcal{I}_{2^\omega})$. We believe it is an interesting line of research to further investigate the relationship between evasion and porosity. In particular, we would like to know whether some of these cardinals can be shown to be equal in ZFC (note that $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{e}_X = \text{unif}(\mathcal{I}_X) < \mathfrak{e}_{2^\omega} = \text{unif}(\mathcal{I}_{2^\omega}) = \omega_2$ holds in the Mathias real model [Br, 3.2.]).

References

- [Bl] A. BLASS, *Cardinal characteristics and the product of countably many infinite cyclic groups*, preprint.
- [Br] J. BRENDLE, *Evasion and prediction*, in preparation.
- [Re] M. REPICKÝ, *Cardinal invariants related to porous sets*, to appear in Proceedings of the Bar–Ilan Conference on Set Theory of the Reals, edited by Haim Judah.

Jörg Brendle
 Department of Mathematics
 Bar–Ilan University
 52900 Ramat–Gan
 ISRAEL
 brendle@bimacs.cs.biu.ac.il
 (till Sept. 30, 1993)

Mathematisches Institut
 Universität Tübingen
 Auf der Morgenstelle 10
 72076 Tübingen
 GERMANY
 (after Oct. 1, 1993)